

N

0

Exact solution of A-D Temperley-Lieb Models

R. KÖBERLE^{1†*}

and

A. LIMA - SANTOS^{2†}

¹Dept. of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544

and

NEC Research Institute, 4 Independence Way, Princeton, NJ 08540

e-mail: roland@puhep1.princeton.edu

²Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de São Carlos

Caixa Postal 676, 13569-905 São Carlos, Brasil

PACS numbers: 75.10.Jm, 05.50.+q, 64.60.Cn

Abstract

We solve for the spectrum of quantum spin chains based on representations of the Temperley-Lieb algebra associated with the quantum groups $\mathcal{U}_q(X_n)$ for $X_n = A_1, B_n, C_n$ and D_n . We employ a generalization of the coordinate Bethe-Ansatz developed previously for the deformed biquadratic spin one chain. As expected, all these models have equivalent spectra, i.e. they differ only in the degeneracy of their eigenvalues. This is true for finite length and open boundary conditions. For periodic boundary conditions the spectra of the lower dimensional representations are contained entirely in the higher dimensional ones. The Bethe states are highest weight states of the quantum group, except for some states with energy zero.

* On leave of absence from Instituto de Física de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo, Caixa Postal 369, São Carlos 13560-970, Brasil.

† Supported in part by CNPq-BRASIL.

1 Introduction

The recent interplay between the field of solvable two-dimensional lattice (or quantum spin chain) models and quantum groups, has generated a lot of interesting results. One particular way of building models, which are quantum group invariant, uses the Temperley-Lieb (TL) algebra[1], satisfied by the Hamiltonian density U_k :

$$U_k^2 = \sqrt{Q}U_k, \quad U_k U_{k\pm 1} U_k = U_k, \\ [U_k, U_l] = 0, \quad |k - l| \geq 2. \quad (1.1)$$

The Hamiltonian is now given by the following sum over N sites:

$$H(q) = \sum_{k=1}^N U_k. \quad (1.2)$$

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, we describe the representations of the TL algebra, constructed as projectors on total spin zero of two neighbouring spins. In section 3, we discuss a modified coordinate BA and show the reasons, why the techniques developed for the spin 1/2 XXZ model don't work here. Section 3 contains the algebraic details of the computation and section 4 is reserved for the conclusions.

2 Representations of the Temperley-Lieb algebra as spin zero projectors.

Representations of the TL algebra, commuting with quantum groups, can be constructed in the following way[2]. Suppose $\mathcal{U}_q(X_n)$ is the universal enveloping algebra of a finite dimensional Lie algebra X_n , equipped with the coproduct $\Delta : \mathcal{U}_q \rightarrow \mathcal{U}_q \otimes \mathcal{U}_q$ [3]. If now $\pi : \mathcal{U}_q \rightarrow \text{End} V_\Lambda$ is a finite dimensional irreducible representation with highest weight Λ and we assume that the decomposition $V_\Lambda \otimes V_\Lambda$ is multiplicity free and includes one trivial representation on V_0 , then the projector $\mathcal{P}_0$ from

$V_\Lambda \otimes V_\Lambda$ onto V_0 is a representation of the TL algebra. The deformation parameter q , which plays the role of a coupling constant in the Hamiltonian, is related to Q as:

$$\sqrt{Q} = \text{Tr}_V(q^{-2\rho}), \quad (2.1)$$

where ρ is half the sum of the positive roots.

By construction $\mathcal{P}_0$ commutes with the quantum group $\mathcal{U}_q(X_n)$.

Since we are not going to use any group-theoretical machinery, we will just lift the relevant formulas off Batchelor and Kuniba[4] in order to display explicitly the Hamiltonians to be diagonalized.

We will consider the following specific cases, $(V_\Lambda, \mathcal{U}_q(X_n)) = (V_{2s\Lambda_1}, \mathcal{U}_q(A_1))$ for spin s , $(V_{\Lambda_1}, \mathcal{U}_q(B_n)), (V_{\Lambda_1}, \mathcal{U}_q(C_n))$ and $(V_{\Lambda_1}, \mathcal{U}_q(D_n))$. I.e, we treat the q -deformations of the spin- s representation of $sl(2)$ and the vector representations of $so(2n+1)$, $sp(2n)$ and $so(2n)$. V_Λ denotes the $\mathcal{U}_q(X_n)$ module with highest weight Λ . Λ_1 is a highest weight of X_n .

Introduce the following notation. Let $e_i, i = 1, \dots, n$ be orthonormal vectors and express the fundamental weight, $\Pi = \Lambda_1 + \dots + \Lambda_n$, the set $\mathcal{A}$ of weights and the coupling constant $\sqrt{Q} \equiv -2\Delta$ as:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 : \mathcal{A} = & \quad \{s(e_1 - e_2), (s-1)(e_1 - e_2), \dots, -s(e_1 - e_2)\}, \\ & \Lambda_1 = (e_1 - e_2)/2, \\ & \rho = (e_1 - e_2)/2, \\ & J = \{s, s-1, \dots, -s\}, \\ & \epsilon(\mu) = (-1)^{\tilde{\mu}}, \\ & \sqrt{Q} = [2s+1]; \\ B_n \ (n \geq 2) : \mathcal{A} = & \quad \{0, \pm e_1, \dots, \pm e_n\}, \\ & \Lambda_i = e_1 + \dots + e_i, \quad (1 \leq i < n), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= (e_1 + \dots + e_n)/2, \quad (i = n), \\
&\rho = (n - 1/2)e_1 + \dots + e_n/2, \\
&J = \{0, \pm 1, \dots, \pm n\}, \\
&\epsilon(\mu) = (-1)^{\tilde{\mu}}, \\
&\sqrt{Q} = [2n - 1][n + 1/2]/[n - 1/2]; \\
C_n : \mathcal{A} = & \{\pm e_1, \dots, \pm e_n\}, \\
&\Lambda_i = e_1 + \dots + e_i, \quad (1 \leq i \leq n), \\
&\rho = ne_1 + \dots + e_n, \\
&J = \{\pm 1, \dots, \pm n\}, \\
&\epsilon(\mu) = \text{sign}(\mu), \\
&\sqrt{Q} = [n][2n + 2]/[n + 1]; \\
D_n : \mathcal{A} = & \{\pm e_1, \dots, \pm e_n\}, \\
&\Lambda_i = e_1 + \dots + e_i, \quad (1 \leq i < n - 1), \\
&= (e_1 + \dots + e_{n-1} - e_n)/2, \quad (i = n - 1), \\
&= (e_1 + \dots + e_{n-1} + e_n)/2, \quad (i = n), \\
&\rho = (n - 1)e_1 + \dots + e_{n-1}, \\
&J = \{0, \pm 1, \dots, \pm n\}, \\
&\sqrt{Q} = [2n - 2][n]/[n - 1]; \\
&\epsilon(\mu) = 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

For $\mu \in J$ the symbol $\tilde{\mu}$ is defined as $\tilde{\mu} = \mu + (1 \pm 1)/4$ for A_1 with $s \in \mathbf{Z} + (1 \pm 1)/4$ and $\tilde{\mu} = 0$ with the exception of $\tilde{0} = 1$ for B_n . The q -number notation is $[x] \equiv (q^x - q^{-x})/(q - q^{-1})$. For $X_n = B_n, C_n, D_n$, we extend the suffix of e_μ to $-n \leq \mu \leq n$ by setting $e_{-\mu} = -e_\mu$ (hence $e_0 = 0$). Using the index set J , above. we can write $\mathcal{A} = \{\mu(e_1 - e_2)\}$ for A_1 and $\mathcal{A} = \{e_\mu | \mu \in J\}$ for B_n, C_n, D_n .

Denoting by $E_{\mu\nu} \in \text{End } V_\Lambda$ the matrix unit, having all elements zero, except at

row μ and column ν , the projector can be written as

$$\mathcal{P}_0 = Q^{-1/2} \sum_{\mu, \nu \in J} \epsilon(\mu) \epsilon(\nu) q^{-\langle e_\mu + e_\nu, \rho \rangle} E_{\mu\nu} \otimes E_{-\mu-\nu}. \quad (2.3)$$

In the following we will refer to all models generically as *higher spin* models for simplicity, even when not talking about A_1

Consider a one-dimensional chain of length N with a "spin" at each site. The spin variables range over the set of weight vectors $v_\mu | \mu \in J$ and our Hilbert space is an N -fold tensor product $V_\Lambda \otimes \dots \otimes V_\Lambda$. For A_1 , these are the q -analogs of the usual spin states.

The Hamiltonian densities acting on two neighboring sites are then given by:

$$\langle k, l | U | i, j \rangle = \epsilon(i) \epsilon(k) q^{-\langle e_i + e_k, \rho \rangle} \delta_{i+j, 0} \delta_{k+l, 0}. \quad (2.4)$$

3 The coordinate Bethe - Ansatz

All the above Hamiltonians are $U(1)$ invariant and we can classify their spectra according to sectors. For A_1 ($s = 1$) the commuting operator is the total spin $S^z = \sum_{k=1}^N S_k^z$ and we set the conserved quantum number $r = N - S^z$. In general it equals $r = N * \omega - S^z$ for A_1 and B_n and $r = N * (\omega - 1/2) - S^z$ for C_n and D_n . We set $\omega = \max J$.

Therefore, there exists a reference state $|\Omega\rangle$, satisfying $H |\Omega\rangle = E_0 |\Omega\rangle$, with $E_0 = 0$. We take $|\Omega\rangle$ to be $|\Omega\rangle = \prod_k^N |\omega, k\rangle$.

In every sector r there are eigenstates degenerate with $|\Omega\rangle$. They contain a set of *impurities*. We call impurity any state obtained by *lowering* some of the $|\omega, k\rangle$'s, such that the sum of any two neighboring spins is non-zero. Since $H(q)$ is a projector on spin zero, all these states are annihilated by $H(q)$. In particular, they do not *move* under the action of $H(q)$, which is the reason for their name.

We will now start to diagonalize $H(q)$ in every sector. Nothing interesting happens in sector $r < 2\omega$. Sector $r = 2\omega$ is more interesting, although still trivial,

since it contains one free pseudoparticle. The main result of this paper is to show that $H(q)$ can be diagonalized in a convenient basis, constructed from products of single pseudoparticle wavefunctions. The energy eigenvalues will be parametrized as a sum of single pseudoparticle contributions.

3.1 The sector $r = 2\omega$, containing one pseudoparticle

Starting with $r = 2\omega$, we encounter the situation, where the states $|j, k\rangle$ and $| -j, k \pm 1\rangle$, $j \neq \omega$ occur in neighboring pairs. They do move under the action of $H(q)$ and mix with states containing one $| -\omega, k\rangle$. Eigenstates are a superposition of $|x[-\omega]\rangle = (\dots \omega \omega \omega \omega \underset{x}{-\omega} \omega \omega \dots)$ and $|x[j, -j]\rangle = (\dots \omega \omega \omega \underset{x}{+j} - j \omega \omega \dots)$, i.e.

$$|2\omega; \dots\rangle = \sum_x \{a_\omega(x) |x[-\omega]\rangle + \sum_j' b_j(x) |x[j, -j]\rangle\}, \quad (3.1)$$

where $\sum_j'$ means $j \in J^* = J - \{\pm\omega\}$ and the ellipses stand for parameters the eigenvector is going to depend on. When $H(q)$ now acts on $|2\omega; \dots\rangle$ it sees the reference configuration, except in the vicinity of x and we obtain the eigenvalue equations

$$\begin{aligned} (E - q^{2\langle \epsilon_\omega, \rho \rangle} - q^{-2\langle \epsilon_\omega, \rho \rangle}) a_\omega(x) &= a_\omega(x+1) + a_\omega(x-1) + \\ &\sum_l' \epsilon(\omega) \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_\omega + e_l, \rho \rangle} b_l(x-1) + \sum_l' \epsilon(-\omega) \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_{-\omega} + e_l, \rho \rangle} b_l(x) \\ Eb_j(x) &= \epsilon(\omega) \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_\omega(x+1) + \epsilon(-\omega) \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_j - e_{-\omega}, \rho \rangle} a_\omega(x) + \\ &\sum_l' \epsilon(j) \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_j + e_l, \rho \rangle} b_l(x), \quad j \in J^*. \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

Eliminating the b_j 's, we get an equation very similar to the XXZ model:

$$(E - \sum_{j \in J} q^{-2\langle e_l, \rho \rangle}) a_\omega(x) = a_\omega(x+1) + a_\omega(x-1). \quad (3.3)$$

We will treat periodic boundary conditions maintaining translational invariance in the following sections. They demand $a_\omega(x+N) = a_\omega(x)$ and $b_j(x+N) = b_j(x)$. We parametrize as: $a_\omega(x) = a_\omega \xi^x$ and $b_l(x) = b_l \xi^x$, $l \in J^*$. Substituting this into equ.(3.2) we get two eigenstates and their energies

$$a_\omega = \epsilon(-\omega)q^{<e_\omega, \rho>} + \epsilon(\omega)q^{-<e_\omega, \rho>}\xi^{-1} \equiv \Gamma(\xi^{-1}) \quad (3.4)$$

$$b_l = \epsilon(l)q^{-<e_l, \rho>}, \quad l \in J^* \quad (3.5)$$

$$E_1 = \sum_l q^{-<e_l, \rho>} + \Gamma(\xi)\Gamma(\xi^{-1}) = \sum_{l \in J} q^{-2<e_l, \rho>} + \xi + \xi^{-1}$$

and a highly degenerate solution with $E_2 = 0$, with the following constraint on the parameters:

$$\sum_l \epsilon(l)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-<e_{l+\omega}, \rho>}b_l + \Gamma(\xi)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-<e_\omega, \rho>}a_\omega = 0. \quad (3.6)$$

Here $\xi = e^{i\theta}$, θ being the momentum determined from the periodic condition to be: $\theta = 2\pi l/N$, with l integer.

We describe this situation by saying that we have two types of pseudoparticles with energies E_1 and E_2 . Whereas the pseudoparticle $|2\omega; \theta\rangle_2$ is degenerate with $|\Omega\rangle$, i.e. propagates with energy $E_2 = 0$, the pseudoparticle $|2\omega; \theta\rangle_1$, propagates with energy

$$E_1 = -2\Delta + 2\cos\theta, \quad 2\Delta \equiv -\sum_{l \in J} q^{-2<e_l, \rho>}. \quad (3.7)$$

As mentioned before, the energy eigenvalues are going to be parametrized as a sum of single pseudoparticle energies. Thus we write:

$$E = \sum_{n=1}^p \epsilon_n \left(\sum_l q^{-<e_l, \rho>} + \Gamma(\xi_n)\Gamma(\xi_n^{-1}) \right), \quad (3.8)$$

where ϵ_n depends on which pseudoparticle we use: $\epsilon_n = 1$ for $E = E_1$ and $E = E_2 = 0$.

3.2 Two pseudoparticles and the XXZ Bethe - Ansatz

The next higher sector would be $r = 2\omega + 1$, but let us treat $r = 4\omega$ first, since then we can compare it with the first nontrivial sector in the XXZ model.

This sector contains states, which consist of two interacting pseudoparticles. We seek these eigenstates in the form:

$$|4\omega; \dots\rangle_{\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2} = \sum_{x_1 < x_2} \{ a_{\omega\omega}(x_1, x_2) |x_1[-\omega], x_2[-\omega]\rangle + \sum_i' b_{\omega i}(x_1, x_2) |x_1[-\omega], x_2[i, -i]\rangle + \sum_j' b_{j\omega}(x_1, x_2) |x_1[j, -j], x_2[-\omega]\rangle + \sum_i' \sum_j' b_{ij}(x_1, x_2) |x_1[i, -i], x_2[j, -j]\rangle \}. \quad (3.9)$$

Translational invariance now specifies $a_{\omega\omega}(x_1, x_2) = \xi^{x_1} a_{\omega\omega}(n)$ and similarly for the other wave functions, where $n = x_2 - x_1$. Periodic boundary conditions require that

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\omega\omega}(n) &= \xi^n a_{\omega\omega}(N - n), \\ b_{i\omega}(n) &= \xi^n b_{\omega i}(N - n), \quad b_{ij}(n) = \xi^n b_{ji}(N - n), \end{aligned} \quad (3.10)$$

where $\xi = \xi_1 \xi_2$ ($\xi_i = e^{i\theta_i}$, $i = 1, 2$) and the total momentum is $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = 2\pi l/N$, with l integer.

According to equ.(3.8), we will parametrize the energy as

$$E = \sum_{n=1}^2 \epsilon_n \left[\sum_l' q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} + \Gamma(\xi_n) \Gamma(\xi_n^{-1}) \right]. \quad (3.11)$$

Let us take the block $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1$ first. We try to build 2-pseudoparticle eigenstates out of translationally invariant products of 1-pseudoparticle excitations at x_1 and x_2 with weight functions $D_i(x_1, x_2)$, $i = 1, 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} |4\omega; \theta_1, \theta_2\rangle_{11} &= \sum_{x_1 < x_2} \{ D_1(x_1, x_2) [\Gamma(\xi_1^{-1}) |x_1[-\omega]\rangle + \sum_i' \epsilon(i) q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} |x_1[i, -i]\rangle] \\ &+ [\Gamma(\xi_2^{-1}) |x_2[-\omega]\rangle + \sum_j' \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} |x_2[j, -j]\rangle] + \\ &D_2(x_1, x_2) [\Gamma(\xi_2^{-1}) |x_1[-\omega]\rangle + \sum_j' \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} |x_1[j, -j]\rangle] \\ &+ [\Gamma(\xi_1^{-1}) |x_2[-\omega]\rangle + \sum_i' \epsilon(i) q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} |x_2[i, -i]\rangle] \}. \end{aligned}$$

Comparing this with equ.(3.9) and using translational invariance, implying $D_2(n) = \xi^n D_1(N - n)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\omega\omega}(n) &= \Gamma(\xi_1^{-1}) \Gamma(\xi_2^{-1}) D(n), \\
b_{\omega i}(n) &= \epsilon(i) q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} [\Gamma(\xi_1^{-1}) D_1(n) + \Gamma(\xi_2^{-1}) D_2(n)], \\
b_{i\omega}(n) &= \epsilon(i) q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} [\Gamma(\xi_2^{-1}) D_1(n) + \Gamma(\xi_1^{-1}) D_2(n)], \\
b_{ij}(n) &= \epsilon(i) \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_i + e_j, \rho \rangle} D(n), \quad 3 \leq n \leq N - 3,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

where $D(n) = D_1(n) + D_2(n)$.

Applying $H(q)$ to the state of (3.9), we obtain a set of coupled equations for $a_{\omega\omega}(n), b_{ij}(n)$. Following [5], we split the equations into *far* equations, when excitations do not meet and *near* equations, containing terms when they are neighbors. The far equations are:

$$\begin{aligned}
(E - 2q^{-2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} - 2q^{2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle}) a_{\omega\omega}(n) &= (1 + \xi)^{-1} a_{\omega\omega}(n + 1) + (1 + \xi) a_{\omega\omega}(n - 1) + \\
&\sum_l' \epsilon(l) \epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_l + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [\xi^{-1} b_{l\omega}(n + 1) + b_{\omega l}(n - 1)] + \\
&\sum_l' \epsilon(l) \epsilon(-\omega) q^{-\langle e_l - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [b_{l\omega}(n) + b_{\omega l}(n)], \quad 2 \leq n \leq N - 2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(E - q^{-2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} - q^{2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle}) b_{\omega j}(n) &= \xi^{-1} b_{\omega j}(n + 1) + \xi b_{\omega j}(n - 1) + \\
&\epsilon(j) \epsilon(-\omega) q^{-\langle e_j - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_{\omega\omega}(n) + \epsilon(j) \epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_{\omega\omega}(n + 1) + \\
&\sum_l' \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \xi^{-1} b_{lj}(n + 1) + \epsilon(-\omega) q^{\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} b_{lj}(n) + \\
&\epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} \xi^{-1} b_{\omega l}(n)], \quad 2 \leq n \leq N - 2,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(E - q^{-2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} - q^{2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle}) b_{j\omega}(n) &= b_{j\omega}(n - 1) + b_{j\omega}(n + 1) + \\
&\epsilon(j) \epsilon(-\omega) q^{-\langle e_j - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_{\omega\omega}(n) + \epsilon(j) \epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \xi a_{\omega\omega}(n - 1) + \\
&\sum_l' \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} b_{jl}(n - 1) + \epsilon(-\omega) q^{\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} b_{jl}(n) + \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{l\omega}(n)], \\
&3 \leq n \leq N - 3,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
E b_{ij}(n) &= \epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(i) q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} \xi b_{\omega j}(n - 1) + \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{\omega i}(n + 1)] + \\
&\epsilon(-\omega) q^{\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(i) q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} b_{\omega j}(n) + \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{\omega i}(n)] +
\end{aligned}$$

$$\sum_l^I \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(i) q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} b_{lj}(n) + \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{il}(n)],$$

$$3 \leq n \leq N - 3. \quad (3.16)$$

We already know them to be satisfied, if we parametrize $D_1(n)$ and $D_2(n)$ by plane waves:

$$D_1(n) = \xi_2^n, \quad D_2(n) = \xi_2^N \xi_1^n. \quad (3.17)$$

The real problem arises of course, when pseudoparticles are neighbors, so that they interact and we have no guarantee that the total energy is a sum of single pseudoparticle energies.

Let us now have a lightning review of the XXZ coordinate BA in order to be able to comment on the features, which are not going to survive generalizations to the present models.

The equations in the sector $r_{XXZ} = 2$ are

$$(E - 2q^{\frac{1}{2}} - 2q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) a(x_1, x_2) = \quad (3.18)$$

$$a(x_1 + 1, x_2) + a(x_1 - 1, x_2) + a(x_1, x_2 + 1) + a(x_1, x_2 - 1), \quad (3.19)$$

if x_1 and x_2 are not neighbors. In case they are we get

$$(E - q^{\frac{1}{2}} - q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) a(x_1, x_1 + 1) = a(x_1 - 1, x_1 + 1) + a(x_1, x_1 + 2). \quad (3.20)$$

One now supposes, that the parametrization equ.(3.9) for $s = 1/2$ solves *both* the above equations. In this case we are allowed to set $x_2 = x_1 + 1$ in equ.(3.18) and subtract it from equ.(3.20), yielding the following consistency condition :

$$-(q^{\frac{1}{2}} + q^{-\frac{1}{2}}) a(x_1, x_1 + 1) = a(x_1, x_1) + a(x_1 + 1, x_1 + 1). \quad (3.21)$$

This gives the *BA equation* for the XXZ model, determining the 2-body phase shift:

$$\xi_2^N = -\frac{1 + \xi + \xi_2(q^{\frac{1}{2}} + q^{-\frac{1}{2}})}{1 + \xi + \xi_1(q^{\frac{1}{2}} + q^{-\frac{1}{2}})}. \quad (3.22)$$

This type of procedure only works for the spin 1/2 XXZ model, due to the following fact. When the two pseudoparticles come together in a configuration like $(\dots +++ - - + + + \dots)$ and when H is applied to the two down spins, it gives zero, since their total S_z equals -1 . But whenever two excitations approach each other becoming neighbors and the Hamiltonian applied to them yields a nonvanishing result, then the representation like equ.(3.12) cannot solve both the *far* and *near* equations. Yet this is exactly the situation arising for higher spins. As we shall see, in this case, the representation equ.(3.12) has to be modified[11], the two-body wavefunction developing a "discontinuity" at minimum separation. We call this the *spin zero rule*.

Now back to our problem to solve the near equations. They are:

$$(E - q^{-2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} - q^{2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle})a_{\omega\omega}(1) = (1 + \xi)^{-1}a_{\omega\omega}(2) + \sum_l' \epsilon(l)q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \xi^{-1}b_{l\omega}(2) + \epsilon(-\omega)q^{\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} b_{\omega l}(1)];$$

$$(E - q^{-2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle})b_{\omega j}(1) = \xi^{-1}b_{\omega j}(2) + \epsilon(j)\epsilon(-\omega)q^{-\langle e_j - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_{\omega\omega}(1) + \epsilon(j)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_{\omega\omega}(2) + \sum_l' \epsilon(l)q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \xi^{-1}b_{lj}(2) + \epsilon(j)q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{\omega l}(1)];$$

$$(E - q^{2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle})b_{j\omega}(2) = b_{j\omega}(3) + \epsilon(j)\epsilon(-\omega)q^{-\langle e_j - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_{\omega\omega}(2) + \epsilon(j)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \xi a_{\omega\omega}(1) + \sum_l' \epsilon(l)q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(-\omega)q^{\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} b_{jl}(2) + \epsilon(j)q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{l\omega}(2)];$$

$$Eb_{ij}(2) = \epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(i)q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} \xi b_{\omega j}(1) + \epsilon(j)q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{i\omega}(3)] + \epsilon(-\omega)q^{\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(i)q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} b_{\omega j}(2) + \epsilon(j)q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{i\omega}(2)] + \sum_l' \epsilon(l)q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(i)q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} b_{lj}(2) + \epsilon(j)q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} b_{il}(2)],$$

$i \neq j;$

$$\begin{aligned}
Eb_{ii}(2) &= \epsilon(i)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_i+e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [\xi b_{\omega i}(1) + b_{i\omega}(3)] + \\
&\epsilon(i)\epsilon(-\omega)q^{-\langle e_i-e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [b_{\omega i}(2) + b_{i\omega}(2)] + \sum_l' \epsilon(l)q^{-\langle e_i+e_l, \rho \rangle} [b_{li}(2) + b_{il}(2)] + \\
&\sum_l' \epsilon(-i)\epsilon(l)q^{-\langle e_l-e_i, \rho \rangle} \mathcal{B}_i^{(l)}. \tag{3.23}
\end{aligned}$$

Here some new states are showing up. $\mathcal{B}_i^{(l)}$ are the wavefunctions of the states of the type $(\dots \omega \omega i_l \ l \ -l \ \omega \omega \dots), l \neq i$. Applying $H(q)$ to them we obtain the system:

$$(E - q^{2\langle e_l, \rho \rangle}) \mathcal{B}_i^{(l)} = \sum_{j \in J^*, j \neq -i} \epsilon(l)\epsilon(j)q^{\langle e_l+e_j, \rho \rangle} \mathcal{B}_i^{(l)} + \epsilon(l)\epsilon(-i)q^{-\langle e_l-e_i, \rho \rangle} b_{ii}(2), \tag{3.24}$$

yielding

$$\mathcal{B}_i^{(l)} = \frac{\epsilon(l)\epsilon(-i)q^{\langle e_l-e_i, \rho \rangle}}{(E - \sum_{j \in J, j \neq -i} q^{-2\langle e_j, \rho \rangle})} b_{ii}(2). \tag{3.25}$$

Eliminating $\mathcal{B}_i^{(l)}$ from equation (3.23), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{E(E+2\Delta)}{E+2\Delta+q^{\langle e_i, \rho \rangle}} b_{ii}(2) &= \epsilon(i)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_i+e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [\xi b_{\omega i}(1) + b_{i\omega}(3)] + \\
&\epsilon(i)\epsilon(-\omega)q^{-\langle e_i-e_\omega, \rho \rangle} [b_{\omega i}(2) + b_{i\omega}(2)] + \\
&\sum_l' \epsilon(l)\epsilon(i)q^{-\langle e_i+e_l, \rho \rangle} [b_{li}(2) + b_{il}(2)]. \tag{3.26}
\end{aligned}$$

In order to solve these equations, we follow [11] and now leave the value of the wavefunctions for nearest separation as arbitrary parameters:

$$\begin{aligned}
a_{\omega\omega}(1) &= \Gamma(\xi)\Gamma(\xi^{-1})D(1) + \mathcal{F}_{a_{\omega\omega}}(1), \\
b_{\omega i}(1) &= \epsilon(i)q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} [\Gamma(\xi^{-1})D_1(1) + \Gamma(\xi^{-1})D_2(1)] + \mathcal{F}_{b_{\omega i}}(1), \\
b_{\omega i}(2) &= \epsilon(i)q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} [\Gamma(\xi^{-1})D_1(2) + \Gamma(\xi^{-1})D_2(2)] + \mathcal{F}_{b_{i\omega}}(2), \\
b_{ij}(2) &= \epsilon(i)\epsilon(j)q^{-\langle e_i+e_j, \rho \rangle} D(2) + \mathcal{F}_{b_{ij}}(2). \tag{3.27}
\end{aligned}$$

In order for this modification to leave the far equations still satisfied, the following conditions have to hold:

$$(1 + \xi^{-1})\mathcal{F}_{a_{\omega\omega}}(1) + \sum_l' \epsilon(l)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_l+e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \mathcal{F}_{b_{\omega l}}(1) +$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_l' \epsilon(l) \epsilon(-\omega) q^{-\langle e_l - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \mathcal{F}_{b_{l\omega}}(2) &= 0, \\
\xi \mathcal{F}_{b_{\omega j}}(1) + \sum_l' \epsilon(l) \epsilon(-\omega) q^{-\langle e_l - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \mathcal{F}_{b_{lj}}(2) &= 0, \\
\mathcal{F}_{b_{j\omega}}(2) + \sum_l' \epsilon(l) \epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_l + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \mathcal{F}_{b_{jl}}(2) &= 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

Now using eqs.(3.12) and equ.(3.27) in equ.(3.26) , we get the following equation for $\mathcal{F}_{b_{ii}}(2)$:

$$\mathcal{F}_{b_{ii}}(2) = \frac{D(2)}{E + 2\Delta}, \quad i \in J^*. \tag{3.29}$$

Doing the same with equ.(3.23), we get:

$$\mathcal{F}_{b_{ij}}(2) = 0, \quad i \neq j. \tag{3.30}$$

These results for $\mathcal{F}_{b_{ii}}(2), \mathcal{F}_{b_{ij}}(2)$ are reasonable. In the first case the colliding excitations satisfy the *zero spin rule* and we get a non-zero result, whereas in the second case the rule is not satisfied and we get zero. Using this in equ.(3.28), we obtain for the remaining constants:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{F}_{a_{\omega\omega}}(1) &= -(q^{-2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} + q^{2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} + 2\Delta) \mathcal{F}_{b_{ii}}(2), \\
\mathcal{F}_{b_{\omega j}}(1) &= -\epsilon(j) \epsilon(-\omega) q^{-\langle e_j - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \mathcal{F}_{b_{ii}}(2), \\
\mathcal{F}_{b_{j\omega}}(2) &= -\epsilon(j) \epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} \mathcal{F}_{b_{ii}}(2), \quad j \in J^*.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.31}$$

Substituting finally the complete parametrization into the remaining near equations, get the following Bethe-Ansatz equation:

$$\frac{D(2)}{E + 2\Delta} = \frac{\xi}{1 + \xi} D(1), \tag{3.32}$$

which can also be rewritten as

$$\xi_2^N = -\frac{\xi_2[(1 + \xi^{-1})\xi_2 - 2\Delta - E]}{\xi_1[(1 + \xi^{-1})\xi_1 - 2\Delta - E]}. \tag{3.33}$$

Using the explicit form of the energy, the set of equations determining the spectrum are:

$$\xi_2^N = -\frac{1 + \xi\xi_2 - 2\Delta\xi_2}{1 + \xi\xi_1 - 2\Delta\xi_1}, \quad \xi^N = 1. \tag{3.34}$$

Notice that this equation is independent of n or any other representation specific quantities. All the models considered show therefore an equivalent spectrum, when parametrized in terms of Δ .

In particular, this is the same consistency condition one finds for the XXZ model, showing that for $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1$, even for periodic boundary conditions, the spectra of all our models are equivalent to the spectrum of the XXZ model, if expressed in terms of Δ .

We will refrain from discussing the other two blocks: $\epsilon_1 = 1, \epsilon_2 = 0$ and $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0$, since the calculations are analogous to the ones presented above. For details the reader might consult reference[11]. Anyhow, the first of the two cases doesn't show up for the more interesting situation of free boundary conditions. It is too asymmetric to satisfy free boundary conditions. This is the reason, why for free boundary conditions, the spectrum of all of our models is equivalent to the XXZ spectrum. The block $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0$ has $E = 0$ and the BA equation reduces to $\xi^N = 1$, being highly degenerate. The eigenvalue $E = 0$ also occurs in the XXZ spectrum, albeit with different degeneracy.

3.3 One pseudoparticle and impurities

Since the setup with pseudoparticles and impurities is a little different from the case of two pseudoparticles, we will dedicate some space to it.

The eigenstates sought for, will be like:

$$\begin{aligned} |2\omega + 1; \dots\rangle = & \sum_{x_1 < x_2} \{a_{\omega k}(x_1, x_2) |x_1[-\omega], x_2[k]\rangle + \sum_i^I b_{jk}(x_1, x_2) |x_1[j, -j], x_2[k]\rangle + \\ & a_{k\omega}(x_1, x_2) |x_1[-k], x_2[-\omega]\rangle + \sum_j^I b_{kj}(x_1, x_2) |x_1[k], x_2[j, -j]\rangle\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.35)$$

Translational invariance and periodic boundary conditions impose:

$$a_{\omega k}(x_1, x_2) = \xi^{x_1} a_{\omega k}(n), \quad b_{jk}(x_1, x_2) = \xi^{x_1} b_{jk}(n), \quad (3.36)$$

$$a_{\omega k}(n) = \xi^n a_{k\omega}(N - n), \quad b_{jk}(n) = \xi^n b_{kj}(N - n), \quad (3.37)$$

where $n = x_2 - x_1$, $\xi = \xi_1 \xi_2$ ($\xi_i = e^{i\theta_i}$, $i = 1, 2$) and the total momentum is $\theta_1 + \theta_2 = 2\pi l/N$, with l integer.

Let us take the block $\epsilon_1 = 1$, building eigenstates out of translationally invariant products of 1-pseudoparticle excitations at x_1 and an impurity at x_2 with weight functions $D_i(x_1, x_2)$, $i = 1, 2$ as in the previous section. This yields the parametrizations:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{\omega k}(n) &= \Gamma(\xi_1^{-1}) D_1(n), \\ a_{k\omega}(n) &= \Gamma(\xi_1^{-1}) D_2(n), \\ b_{jk}(n) &= \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} D_1(n), \\ b_{kj}(n) &= \epsilon(j) q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle} D_2(n). \end{aligned} \quad (3.38)$$

The far equations for the impurity at the right are now:

$$\begin{aligned} (E - 2q^{-2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle} - 2q^{2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle}) a_{\omega k}(x_1, x_2) &= a_{\omega k}(x_1 - 1, x_2) + a_{\omega k}(x_1 + 1, x_2) + \\ &\sum_l' \epsilon(l) \epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_l + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} b_{lk}(x_1 - 1, x_2) + \sum_l' \epsilon(l) \epsilon(-\omega) q^{-\langle e_l - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} b_{lk}(x_1, x_2), \\ x_1 + 2 &\leq x_2 \leq N - x_1 - 2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.39)$$

$$\begin{aligned} E b_{jk}(x_1, x_2) &= \epsilon(j) \epsilon(\omega) q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_{\omega k}(x_1 + 1, x_2) + \\ &\epsilon(j) \epsilon(-\omega) q^{-\langle e_j - e_\omega, \rho \rangle} a_{\omega k}(x_1, x_2) + \\ &\sum_l' \epsilon(j) \epsilon(l) q^{-\langle e_j + e_l, \rho \rangle} [\epsilon(i) q^{-\langle e_i, \rho \rangle} b_{lk}(x_1, x_2)], \\ x_1 + 3 &\leq x_2 \leq N - x_1 - 3, \end{aligned} \quad (3.40)$$

and analogous equations for the impurity at the left. Eliminating the b -functions, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} (E - \sum_{l \in J} q^{-2\langle e_l, \rho \rangle}) a_{\omega k}(x_1, x_2) &= a_{\omega k}(x_1 - 1, x_2) + a_{\omega k}(x_1 + 1, x_2), \\ (E - \sum_{l \in J} q^{-2\langle e_l, \rho \rangle}) a_{k\omega}(x_1, x_2) &= a_{k\omega}(x_1, x_2 - 1) + a_{k\omega}(x_1, x_2 + 1), \\ x_1 + 3 &\leq x_2 \leq N - x_1 - 3. \end{aligned} \quad (3.41)$$

We know them to be satisfied, if the energy is given by equ.(3.11). The near equations require of course the by now customary treatment of modifying the ansatz of the wavefunctions at nearest separations.

The near equations for the impurity at the right are:

$$(E - 2q^{-2\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle})a_{\omega k}(x, x+1) = a_{\omega k}(x-1, x+1) + \sum_l' \epsilon(l)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_l + e_\omega, \rho \rangle}b_{lk}(x-1, x+1), \quad (3.42)$$

$$Eb_{jk}(x, x+1) = \epsilon(j)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle}a_{\omega k}(x+1, x+2) + \epsilon(j)\epsilon(-\omega)q^{-\langle e_j - \omega, \rho \rangle}a_{\omega k}(x, x+2) + \sum_l' \epsilon(j)\epsilon(l)q^{-\langle e_j + e_l, \rho \rangle}b_{lk}(x, x+2), \quad (3.43)$$

$$Eb_{jj}(x, x+2) = \epsilon(j)\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle}a_{\omega j}(x+1, x+2) + \epsilon(j)\epsilon(-\omega)q^{-\langle e_j - \omega, \rho \rangle}a_{\omega j}(x, x+2) + \epsilon(-j)\epsilon(-\omega)q^{\langle e_j + e_\omega, \rho \rangle}a_{j\omega}(x, x+1) + \epsilon(-j)\epsilon(\omega)q^{\langle e_j - \omega, \rho \rangle}a_{j\omega}(x, x+2) + \sum_l' \epsilon(j)\epsilon(l)q^{-\langle e_j + e_l, \rho \rangle}b_{lj}(x, x+2) + \sum_l' \epsilon(-j)\epsilon(l)q^{\langle e_j - e_l, \rho \rangle}b_{jl}(x, x+1). \quad (3.44)$$

They can be solved modifying the parametrization for nearest neighbors in the usual way. The result is:

$$a_{\omega k}(1) = \Gamma(\xi^{-1})\xi_2 + \mathcal{F}_{a_{k\omega}}, \quad b_{jk}(2) = \epsilon(j)q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle}\xi_2^2 + \mathcal{F}_{b_{jk}}, \quad (3.45)$$

$$a_{k\omega}(1) = \Gamma(\xi^{-1})\xi_2^N \xi_1 + \mathcal{F}_{a_{k\omega}}, \quad b_{kj}(1) = \epsilon(j)q^{-\langle e_j, \rho \rangle}\xi_2^N \xi_1 + \mathcal{F}_{b_{kj}}, \quad (3.46)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{a_{k\omega}} &= -\epsilon(\omega)q^{-\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle}\xi_2^N, \quad \mathcal{F}_{b_{kj}} = \epsilon(k)q^{-\langle e_k, \rho \rangle}\xi_2^N \delta_{k+j,0}, \\ \mathcal{F}_{a_{\omega k}} &= -\epsilon(-\omega)q^{\langle e_\omega, \rho \rangle}\xi_2, \quad \mathcal{F}_{b_{jk}} = \epsilon(-k)q^{\langle e_k, \rho \rangle}\xi_2 \delta_{k-j,0}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.47)$$

with $\xi^N = 1, \xi_1^{N-2}\xi_2 = 1$ resulting from periodic boundary conditions.

4 Free boundary conditions

It is for free boundary conditions, that the Hamiltonian $H(Q)$ commutes with the quantum group $\mathcal{U}_q(X_n)$. As expected, the Bethe states are highest weight states of $\mathcal{U}_q(X_n)$, except some $E = 0$ states. Since the extension of the BA-procedure from the periodic boundary conditions to the free case, follows exactly the lines of ref.[11], we will only state the results for the sector $r = 4$.

Take the block $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 1$. The nearest approach constants to be added to the now standing waves are the same as in the periodic case, namely eqs.(3.30),(3.31), only $\mathcal{F}_{b_{ii}}(2)$ is different[11]). The BA equations are now:

$$\xi_a^{2N} = \prod_{b=1, b \neq a}^r \frac{b(\xi_a^{-1}, \xi_b)}{b(\xi_a, \xi_b)}, \quad a = 1, 2, \quad (4.1)$$

where

$$b(\xi_a, \xi_b) = \frac{\xi_b}{\xi_a} [\xi_b + \xi_a^{-1} - 2\Delta - E_{ab}] [\xi_b^{-1} + \xi_a^{-1} - 2\Delta - E_{ab}]. \quad (4.2)$$

and

$$E_{ab} = 2 \sum_l^I q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle} + \Gamma(\xi_a) \Gamma(\xi_a^{-1}) + \Gamma(\xi_b) \Gamma(\xi_b^{-1}). \quad (4.3)$$

The only other block is $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = 0, E = 0$. It is again highly degenerate with $\mathcal{F}_{b_{ii}}(2), \xi_1, \xi_2$ as free parameters[†].

Thus all models have *spectra equivalent to the one of the XXZ model*.

5 Conclusion

We obtained the spectra of quantum spin chain models, arising as representations of the Temperley-Lieb algebra associated with quantum groups. The tool is a modified version of the coordinate Bethe Ansatz, since the simpler algebraic Bethe Ansatz is not immediately available for these models. We find that all models have equivalent

[†]Actually there is one more free parameter, called α_5 in ref.[11].

spectra, i.e. they differ at most in their degeneracies. The energy eigenvalues are given by

$$E = \sum_{n=1}^p (\epsilon_n(-2 * \Delta + \Gamma(\xi_n)\Gamma(\xi_n^{-1})), \quad (5.1)$$

where $-2\Delta = \sum_l' q^{-\langle e_l, \rho \rangle}$ and the rapidities ξ_n are solutions of the BA equations.

In the sector r we may have p pseudoparticles $N_{\omega^*-1}, N_{\omega^*-1}, \dots, N_{-\omega^*+1}$ impurities of the type $(\omega^* - 1), (\omega^* - 2), \dots, (-\omega^* + 1)$, respectively, such that

$$N_{\omega^*-1} + 2N_{\omega^*-1} + \dots + (2\omega^* - 1)N_{-\omega^*+1} = r - 2\omega^*p. \quad (5.2)$$

Here $\omega^* = \omega$ for A_1 and B_n and $\omega^* = \omega - 1/2$ for C_n and D_n .

For example, for periodic boundary conditions[‡], the total rapidity $\xi = \xi_1 \xi_2 \dots \xi_p \xi_{imp}$, $\xi_{imp} = \xi_{p+1} \xi_{p+2} \dots \xi_{r-\sigma}$ obeys $\xi^N = 1$ and the BA equations for $E \neq 0$ are:

$$\xi_a^N \xi_{imp}^2 = \prod_{b=1, b \neq a}^{r-\sigma} - \frac{\xi_a (1 + (\xi_a \xi_b)^{-1} \xi_a - \epsilon_{ab})}{\xi_b (1 + (\xi_a \xi_b)^{-1} \xi_b - \epsilon_{ab})}, \quad (5.3)$$

where $\epsilon_{ab} = E_{ab} + 2\Delta$ and σ can be fixed for each allowed case from the equations (5.2). The Bethe eigenstates are highest weight states of the quantum group, except for the states with energy $E = 0$, for which this is not always true. In the sector r with p impurities and $E \neq 0$, the total rapidity $\xi = \xi_1 \xi_2 \dots \xi_p \xi_{imp}$, $\xi_{imp} = \xi_{p+1} \xi_{p+2} \dots \xi_{r-p}$ obeys $\xi^N = 1$ and the BA equations are:

$$\xi_a^N \xi_{imp}^2 = \prod_{b=1, b \neq a} - \frac{\xi_a (1 + (\xi_a \xi_b)^{-1} \xi_a - \epsilon)}{\xi_b (1 + (\xi_a \xi_b)^{-1} \xi_b - \epsilon)}, \quad (5.4)$$

where $\epsilon = E + 2\Delta$. The Bethe eigenstates are highest weight states of the quantum group, except for the states with energy $E = 0$, for which this is not always true. These results are expected, but as far as we know, unproven using only Temperley-Lieb algebraic statements as input.

Acknowledgments

It is R.K.'s pleasure to thank C.Callan and W. Bialek for their support.

[‡]We don't list the equations for free boundary conditions, since they are identical to those of ref.[11].

References

- [1] Temperley H N V and Lieb E 1971 *Proc. R. Soc. A* **322** 251.
- [2] Reshetikhin N Y 1988 Quantized universal enveloping algebras, the Yang-Baxter equation and invariants of links I, LOMI Preprint E 4. *Proc. R. Soc. A* **322** 251.
- [3] Drinfeld V G 1986 ICM Proceedings Berkeley 798; Jimbo M 1985 *Lett. Math. Phys.* **10** 63.
- [4] Batchelor M T and Kuniba A 1991 *J. Phys. A* **24** 2599.
- [5] Parkinson J.B. 1988 *J. Phys. C: Solid State Phys.* **21** 3793.
- [6] Köberle R. and Lima - Santos A. 1994 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 5409.
- [7] Yang C N 1967 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **19** 1312; Baxter R J 1982 *Exactly Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics* (Academic Press, London).
- [8] Takhtajan L A and Faddeev L D 1979 *Russ. Math. Surveys* **34** 11.
- [9] Bethe H. 1931 *Z. Physik* **71** 205.
- [10] Alcaraz F.C., Köberle R. and Lima - Santos A. 1992 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **7** 7615.
- [11] Köberle R. and Lima - Santos A. 1994 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **27** 5409.
- [12] Barber M. and Batchelor M.T. 1989 *Phys. Rev.* **B40** 4621.
- [13] Klümper A. 1990 *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B* **4** 171.
- [14] Batchelor M.T., Mezincescu L., Nepomechie R.I., Rittenberg V. 1990 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **23** L141.

- [15] Kulish P. P., Reshetikhin N. Yu. and Sklyanin E.L. 1981 *Lett. Math Phys.* **5** 393.
- [16] Alcaraz F.C., Barber M.N., Batchelor M.T., Baxter R.J. and Quispel G.R.W. 1987 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **20** 6397.
- [17] Smirnov F. A. 1991 *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A6** 40.
- [18] Alcaraz F. C. and Malvezzi A. 1992 *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **25** 4535.